

REMARKS

This is a response to the final Office Action mailed May 15, 2007. Claims 1, 3, and 5 are amended. Claims 1-6 are pending.

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Henneberger et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,067,678), Fox (U.S. Patent No. 7,034,227), and Barybin et al. (SU 1272387). Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections. Reconsideration is requested for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1 recites mounting a plurality of side elements to the base element along the linear mating edges by attaching second mounting structures formed on the side elements with the first mounting structure of the respective linear mating edge, the first and second mounting structures being connected to couple the side elements to the base elements.

Neither Henneberger nor Fox discloses or suggests a system formed of multiple components. Therefore, neither discloses or suggests attaching second mounting structures formed on side elements with the first mounting structure of the respective linear mating edge of the base element, as recited by claim 1.

Further, the Examiner provides no rationale as to how one skilled in art at the time of invention would modify either Henneberger or Fox in view of Barybin to arrive at the claimed invention. None of Henneberger, Fox, nor Barybin, alone or in combination, discloses or suggests mounting of base and side elements configured as recited in claim 1.

Reconsideration and allowance of independent claim 1 and dependent claim 2 are therefore requested for these reasons.

Claim 3 recites mounting a second mounting structure of the selected mating elements to the base element along the sides to form the cable routing system, wherein the first or second mounting structures fits within the other of the first or second mounting structures to couple the selected mating elements to the base element. None of the references discloses or suggests such a method. For example, neither Henneberger nor Fox discloses or suggests that the integrated systems disclosed therein can be formed by first or second mounting structures that fit within the other of the first or second mounting structures to couple the selected mating elements to the base element, as recited by claim 3. Independent claim 3 and dependent claim 4 are therefore patentably distinguished from Henneberger, Fox, and Barybin. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Claim 5 recites mounting a plurality of side elements to the base along the opposite sides of the base elements by connecting a first mounting structure defined by the side of the base to a second mounting structure defined by the side elements, wherein the first or second mounting structures fits within the other of the first or second mounting structures to couple the side elements to the base. Independent claim 5 and dependent claim 6 are therefore patentably distinguished from Henneberger, Fox, and Barybin for at least these reasons. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

The Examiner states that forming the side elements integrally with the base element as disclosed by Henneberger or Fox appears to be an improvement over forming the side elements separately. Action, p. 3, ll. 5-11. However, in some applications, it is desirable to deliver the cable routing system in pieces and allow the end user to assemble the base and side elements. For example, the planar base elements provide a platform upon which a wide variety of cable routing systems can be assembled with the desired widths, lengths, and side elements to enable efficient and protective routing of the cables. Such customization and flexibility, both during assembly and preferably at a later time if modifications are needed, is achieved by using the matable base and side elements. Application, p. 8, ll. 24-30. It is therefore submitted that there are advantages to such a configuration.

Favorable reconsideration in the form of a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited. If a telephone conference would be helpful in resolving any issue, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned at the telephone number noted.

Respectfully submitted,
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
(612) 332-5300

Date: September 17, 2007

/Robert A. Kalinsky
Name: Robert A. Kalinsky
Reg. No.: 50,471